

ARMENIAN LIBRARY OF THE CALOUSTE GULBENKIAN FOUNDATION  
BIBLIOTHÈQUE ARMÉNIENNE DE LA FONDATION CALOUSTE GULBENKIAN

ՆՈՅԿՈՎՈՒ ՍՍՏԵՆՈՉՈՐ ԳՈՐԾՈՒՍ ԿԻԼԻՉԷԿԵՈՒ ՆԻՇԱՐԿՈՒԹԵՈՒ

ARMENIAN STUDIES  
ÉTUDES ARMÉNIENNES  
IN MEMORIAM HAÏG BERBÉRIAN

DICKRAN KOUYMJIAN

Editor



CALOUSTE GULBENKIAN FOUNDATION

1 9 8 6

## THE TENTH CENTURY ARMENIAN HISTORIAN UXTANĒS: WAS HE BISHOP OF SEBASTIA OR EDESSA?

SOUREN E. KOLANDJIAN

The historian Uxtanēs lived and worked in the tenth century. Biographical information that has come down to us is sparse. The basic source on his life and works appears in his own *History* (1). From that very work we know that he studied with the famous Armenian savant and pedagogue Anania Narekac'i, with whom he was also associated through personal friendship. The great medieval poet, Grigor Narekac'i, his brother Hovhannēs, and others, had studied in the Narek monastery founded by Anania.

In the first chapter of his *History*, which is a letter addressed to his great teacher Narekac'i, Uxtanēs describes most beautifully how they, teacher and pupil, seated on the banks of the Axurean River, had intimate conversations and how his teacher encouraged Uxtanēs to write a history. Later, Anania Narekac'i, in a separate letter to Uxtanēs, reminded him of the necessity of writing a book of history.

Uxtanēs' *History* was originally written in three sections; however, only the first and second (partly defective) divisions have come down to us. His *History's* first section is titled «History of the Patriarchs and Kings of the Armenians», and consists of seventy-six chapters. It covers the period from Adam to the Armenian Arsacid dynasty, including the history of Tiridates III, the Great, his rule, and the spread of Christianity.

As primary sources for the first section Uxtanēs has used the Bible and most of the Armenian historians who preceded him, especially

(1) Uxtanēs episkopos, part I, *Patmut'iwn Hayoc'*, part II, *Patmut'iwn bažanman Vrac' i Hayoc'*, Vałarsapat, 1871.

Movsēs Xorenac'i, as well as Agat'angelos, Yovhan Mamikonean, and Movsēs Kałankatuac'i. He also had available to him the now lost history of Šapuh Bagratuni; he used the book of Caesars or the chronography ascribed to Anania Širakac'i, as well as discourses of church fathers, translated testaments, etc. However, we believe that this section has not reached us in its entirety, for it terminates at the beginning of the fourth century, and does not continue to the author's own time.

The second section of Uxtanēs' history is titled «History of the Separation of the Georgians from the Armenians», and consists of seventy chapters. Basically, it covers the end of the sixth century and the beginning of the seventh century, and concerns the history of the relations between the Armenian and Georgian churches. For this part the historian has depended on basic archival documents, and, with annotations, has employed topics from the *Book of Letters* (*Girk' T'it'oc'*), as well as other archival papers, even translations of Georgian documents.

As is evident, the second section has reached us incomplete at the end; however, our many years of research in the collection of fragments of manuscripts at the Maštoc' Matenadaran has enabled us to bring to light the greater part of the final sections of the second part of Uxtanēs' *History* which consisted of eleven probably as yet unpublished manuscript pages.

The third section of Uxtanēs' *History*, which, because of its uniqueness should have been its most valuable part, has unfortunately not reached us. It should have covered the baptism of the *Cad* and a detailed account of the spread of their settlement. That important work of an historico-geographical character would have described their principal provinces and villages, cities and fortresses, monasteries and monks. The *Cad* people were those Armenians forced into Greek doctrine and who, during Uxtanēs' time and with his direct help, were successfully brought back into the bosom of the Armenian church. That Uxtanēs had written about this matter (as mentioned in his foreword, as we have said) is indisputably established through the thirteenth century historian Mxit'ar Ayrivanec'i who saw and used the document in his day (2). However, we are sorry to say that not even

(2) G. Yovsēp'ean, *Mxit'ar Ayrivanec'i, noragiwt arjanagrut'iwn ew erker*, Jerusalem, 1931, p. 19.

a fragment has yet been found of that most important section, either in the Maštoc' Matenadaran of Erevan, or in various manuscript collections in the dispersion.

Despite its amputated and incomplete condition the Uxtanēs *History*, even in its present state, serves as a primary source and provides an important aid for completing the historiography of the Armenian people.

From Uxtanēs work and commentaries on it, it can probably be concluded that he traveled from end to end of historial Armenia and even outside its borders. It appears that neither Lesser Armenia nor Vaspurakan were unfamiliar to him, nor the banks of the Axurean, nor the catholicate of Argina, nor even the world of the Georgians.

We wish to devote this initial article to the as yet unsolved question of whether Uxtanēs was the diocesan bishop of Sebastia or of Uṛha (Edessa). This question has been the subject of debate for centuries; up to the present time it invokes uncertainty in the critical literature. In medieval times Armenian authors were identified by their birthplace as well as their given name, and the former served as a sort of surname, for example, Movsēs Xorenac'i, Anania Širakac'i, Grigor Narekac'i, and also Grigor, bishop of Aršarunik', Yesu Xorxoruneac', etc. This question was considered important by the editor of the *Revue des Etudes Arméniennes*, the assiduous Armenologist Haïg Berbérian, who, knowing that we were preparing a critical study of Uxtanēs wrote many letters stressing the need to clarify this question which he himself had been examining for a long time. However, until now we had no opportunity to probe the matter. It is now our pleasure to dedicate this treatise to the memory of that great Armenologist.

First, let us see in chronological order where our historians have placed Uxtanēs as diocesan bishop. During the thirteenth century four important historians referred to the *History*. For example, Vardan Arevelc'i, in reflecting on the feast of the Forty Martyrs of Sebastia, mentions our historian simply as Uxtanēs, saying, «Uxtanēs ordained the feast... on March 9» (3). Another illustrious historian of the same century, Kirakos Ganjakec'i, mentions Uxtanēs twice. In his list of references Ganjakec'i mentions him as bishop of Uṛha, writing

(3) Vardan vardapet, *Hawak'umn patmut'ean Vardanay vardapeti*, ed. L. Ališan, Venice, 1862, p. 42.

the following, «And Uxtanēs, bishop of Urĥa, who wrote of the separation of the Armenians and the Georgians, by the hand of Kiwrion» (4). According to footnotes of the critical publication of Ganjakec'i, variants of the place name appearing in the manuscript are given as «Urĥayec'i», «Urĥayoc'», and «Urĥayow» (5). In another place Kirakos Ganjakec'i mentions Uxtanēs again, but does not refer to where he was bishop, no doubt, not to repeat his earlier observation, «this most certainly shows you that Bishop Uxtanēs...» (6). However, contrary to what was conveyed by Kirakos Ganjakec'i, the historian Mxit'ar Ayrivanec'i of the same century reveals that Uxtanēs was bishop of Sebastia, designates him a saint, and at the same time makes it known that the third part of his history existed at that time. In his volume on the Cad people Mxit'ar Ayrivanec'i has written the following, «And on this day the Cad people parted from the Armenians by the hand of the vainglorious cleric P'arsman, as related by St. Uxtanēs, bishop of Sebastia» (7). Let us point out that the same Mxit'ar in his *History of Armenians*, twice mentions Uxtanēs again, but without stating where he was diocesan bishop, once calling him «bishop Uxtanēs», and the other time, «historian Uxtanēs» (8).

Mxit'ar Ayrivanec'i's information is consistent with that of Step'anos Ōrbelean, historian of the late thirteenth century. The latter, writing in his turn of the matter of the separation of the Georgian and Armenian churches, says, «for confirmation we examined St. Uxtanēs, bishop of Sebastia» (9), and in another place, «...and if you wish a complete and detailed account, read Uxtanēs and the *History of the Albanians*, and examine the *Girk' t't'loc'*, and Lord Maštoc', who wrote at the request of Gēorg, catholicos of the Armenians» (10).

Thus, four important thirteenth century historians have mentioned the tenth century historian Uxtanēs. However, if one of these, Vardan Arevelc'i, says nothing about where Uxtanēs was a bishop, another, Kirakos Ganjakec'i, mentions that he was bishop of Urĥa. And the

(4) Kirakos Ganjakec'i, *Patmut'iwn Hayoc'*, critical edition, K. A. Melik'-Ōhanjanean, Erevan, 1961, p. 7.

(5) *Ibid.*, p. 7, line 13.

(6) *Ibid.*, p. 46.

(7) Yovsēp'ean, *Mxit'ar*, p. 19.

(8) Mxit'ar Ayrivanec'i, *Patmut'iwn Hayoc'*, ed. Moscow, 1860, pp. 23 and 57.

(9) Step'annos Ōrbelean, *Patmut'iwn nahangin Sisakan*, ed. Tiflis, 1910, p. 99.

(10) *Ibid.*, p. 106.

remaining two, Mxit'ar Ayrivanec'i and Step'anos Ōrbelean, agree that he was bishop of Sebastia, or bishop of the people of Sebastia.

We have no knowledge of primary sources from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries regarding Uxtanēs. All we have is the bibliography, regarded as faulty, prepared by Nersēs Palenc', who had joined the Catholic church in Avignon in 1341. He lists as his eighth book, in Latin letters, *Octavensis, Toctanensis, Occenensis*. This was first established as the *History of Uxtanēs* by the Armenologist H. S. Anasean (11). However, nothing is mentioned in this corrupt source in Armenian written with Latin letters about Uxtanēs' episcopal position. Again, our historian is mentioned only as «Uxtanēs» by an Armenian-Greek author in a letter written to Yovhan Damaskac'i (12).

In subsequent centuries, instead of being clarified, the question became even more obscure. We have two references to Uxtanēs from the seventeenth century. The first concerns a manuscript in the Maštoc' Matenadaran, a catalogue titled *These Are All the Histories*, which mentions in the fourteenth position, «Bishop Uxtanēs, who wrote of the separation of the Georgians» (13). From the same seventeenth century comes the list *History of the Armenians* of Vardan Bališec'i, which in the seventeenth position mentions «Uxtanēs, the History of the Separation of the Georgians from the Armenians» (14). As it appears in the above-mentioned references, only Uxtanēs' name is cited and not one word on the location of his office.

Basically the same situation still prevails in Armenian sources of the eighteenth century. Our historian is mentioned only as Uxtanēs, or as bishop of Uṛha. For example, Łazar Ĵahkec'i in his catalog of Armenian historians mentions Uxtanēs as «bishop of Uṛha» (15). Similarly, contemporary to the latter, the zealous spiritual and lay leader, Esayi Hasan Ĵalaleanc', catholicos of the Ałuank', mentions «Uxtanēs, bishop of Uṛha» in his list of Armenian histo-

(11) Hakop Anasean, *Vardan Aygekc'in ir norahayt erkeri luysi tak*, Venice, 1969, p. 36.

(12) Loys, Constantinople, 1906, p. 355.

(13) Erevan, Matenadaran, MS no. 126, ff. 255v-256, cf. H. S. Anasyan, *Haykakan matenagitutyun 5-18 dd.*, vol. I, Erevan, 19, pp. L-LI.

(14) N. Akinean, «Vardan v. Bališec'i aṛaj'nord Amirtoli vank'in», *HA* (1952), p. 57.

(15) Łazar Čahkec'i, *Girk' astuacabanakan, or koč'i Draxt c'ankali*, Constantinople, 1735, p. 646.

rians (16). In the second half of the same century Petros Vardapet Ĵulayec'i Martikenc', on the suggestion of the chief abbot Melgonean of Venice, advised Mik'ayēl Č'amč'ean (March 23, 1772) that among the Armenian historians there also could be found, «Abraham Aġbat'anec'i in Dvin, Uxtanēs, bishop of Uṛha» (17). Of course, it is from this source, and from the history of Kirakos Ganjakec'i, that the later historian Mik'ayēl Č'amč'ean mentions Uxtanēs as being from Uṛha. Listing sources not available in Venice, he has written, «Besides these authors there are more than ten older ones which we do not have, and these are «Uxtanēs, bishop of Uṛha, ...» (18). Later, again in a letter Fr. Č'amč'ean wrote in 1797 from Venice to Harut'iwn Sahakean Ĵulayec'i, he mentioned high on his list of historians not to be found in the Venice library, «Uxtanēs Uṛhayec'i» (19).

In far off Madras the Armenian periodical *Azdarar*, published by Yacob Ayubeanc', shows an entry in a bibliography of Armenian and translated historians, «Uxtanēs, a historian covering the division of the Georgians and the Armenians» (20).

Attempts were made in the nineteenth century to publish Uxtanēs. In the archives of the American Armenologist H. Kurdian there is a letter written from Constantinople at the beginning of the nineteenth century by Grigor P'eštimalčean in which he expresses a desire to have a copy made and sent to him of the rare «Uxtanēs History» for the purpose of later publishing it. Kurdian learned that the letter was to be sent to the library of the Armenian Patriarchate of Jerusalem, and, therefore, a manuscript of that history should be found there (21). However, according to our information, there is no copy of Uxtanēs in Jerusalem.

In his biographical dictionary Matt'eos Maġak'-T'ēop'ilean (22) states that according to Kirakos Ganjakec'i, Uxtanēs was the bishop

(16) Esayi Hasan Ĵalaleanc', *Patmut'iwn kam yišatak...kat'ulikosēn Atuanic'*, Šuši, 1839, p. 2.

(17) Lewond Tayan, *Mayr divan Mxit'areanc' Venetik i S. Lazar, 1707-1773*, Venice, 1930, pp. 278-9.

(18) Mik'ayēl Č'amč'ean, *Patmut'iwn Hayoc'*, vol. I, Venice, 1784, p. 18.

(19) *Bazmavēp* (1926), pp. 301-2.

(20) *Azdarar* (1795), no. 8.

(21) From our archives, see also Babgen Giwleserean, *C'uc'ak jeragrāc' Lalat'ioy Azgayin Matenadarani Hayoc'*, Antelias, 1961, pp. 768-9.

(22) Matt'eos Maġak'-T'ēop'ileanc', *Kensagrut'iwn ereveli aranc'*, vol. II, Venice, 1839, p. 122.

of Urha. Bishop Yovhannēs Šahxat'uncan also recognizes our historian simply as «Uxtanēs» (23). In his list of Armenian authors Patkanean mentions Uxtanēs as bishop of Edessa, that is, also as diocesan primate of Urha (24). Archbishop Mik'ayēl Sallant'ean identifies him as «Uxtanēs, bishop historian» (25).

In 1860, Mser Mserean published for the first time a fragment of Uxtanēs which tells about the discovery of the true cross by empress Helene, but nothing is said about where the historian served in office (26). Similarly, the Armenologist M.-F. Brosset often refers to Uxtanēs and his work. In his Russian and French catalogue of manuscripts in the Eĵmiacin library, published in 1840, he mentions our historian simply as bishop Uxtanēs; however, in a footnote he observes that the historian is not mentioned by Somal. But to Č'amč'ean Uxtanēs was known as the bishop of Urha, since he did not have this history available to him, and he was obliged to use Kirakos Ganjakec'i as a source (27). In his subsequent three works, which deal with Uxtanēs, Brosset references to him only as bishop Uxtanēs (28). In 1871, however, when Brosset published Uxtanēs' French translation along with the history of Kirakos Ganjakec'i, he entitled it «Uxtanēs of Urha, tenth century» (29). Even in the main catalogue of Eĵmiacin, identified as the Karenean, number 1673 is listed as «Uxtanēs, bishop of Urha, *History*» (30).

(23) Yovhannēs Šahxat'uncanc', *Storagrut'iwn katolikē Eĵmiacni ew hing gawarac' Araratay*, Eĵmiacin, 1842, p. 183.

(24) M. Patcanian, «Catalogue de la littérature arménienne...», *Bulletin de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St.-Pétersbourg*, II (1860), p. 101.

(25) Mik'ayēl Sallat'eanc', *Hamarōt žamanakagrakan patmuf'iwn Hayoc'*, Smyrna, 1865, p. 17.

(26) Č'rak'al, (Moscow, 1860), no. 6, pp. 89-90.

(27) M. Brosset, *Catalogue de la Bibliothèque d'Edchmiadzin*, St. Petersburg, 1840.

(28) M. Brosset, «Histoire de la scission religieuse entre les Géorgiens et les Arméniens depuis la fin du VI<sup>e</sup> siècle», *Additions et Eclaircissements à l'Histoire de la Géorgie*, St. Petersburg, 1851, pp. 107-125; *idem*, «Examen d'un passage de l'historien arménien Oukhtanēs relatif à la prétendue conquête 'de l'Ibérie' par Nabouchodonosor», *Mélanges Asiatiques*, V (1864), pp. 742-760; *idem*, «Etudes sur l'historien arménien Oukhtanēs, X<sup>e</sup> siècle», *Mélanges Asiatiques*, VI (1868), pp. 13-89.

(29) M. Brosset, trad., *Deux historiens arméniens, Kiracos du Gantzac, XIII<sup>e</sup> s., 'Histoire d'Arménie'. Oukhtanēs d'Ourha, X<sup>e</sup> s., 'Histoire en trois parties'*, St. Petersburg, 1870.

(30) Y. Kareneanc', *Mayr c'uc'ak jeragir matenic' gradarani Srboy At'oroyn Eĵmiacni*, Tiflis, 1863.

It follows from the above that for many centuries, in primary sources and in the printed literature, Uxtanēs is identified sometimes as Uḡhayec'i sometimes as of Sebastac'i, or only by the name of Uxtanēs. In order to put an end to the uncertainties surrounding this matter, and to arrive at a correct conclusion, we must first of all occupy ourselves with a careful study of the principal manuscript now in the Maštoc' Matenadaran, as well as of the only printed edition of it.

That Uxtanēs was in fact the bishop of Sebastia is attested to by the following notation given at the start of the manuscript, «This *History* of three sections as set forth by his eminence Uxtanēs *Se* (emphasis ours), and called for by Anania of Narek, primate of Narek Vank' and principal doctor» (31). Let us mention in passing that on the inside front cover, on a decoratively printed, pasted-on piecet here appears the following, in a later hand, «Uxtanēs, bishop of *Urha* (emphasis ours), *History*, quarto, *boloragir* on paper, with colophon in the year of the Armenian calendar 1112, in the year of our Lord 1663» (32). However, the colophon mentioned does not appear in the manuscript. Evidently the colophon must have fallen off before the time of Karenean's catalog (1863) and the publication of Uxtanēs' *History* (1871), since these publications make no mention of it. Thus, it is the «Se» abbreviation appearing in the title of the original manuscript that led the publisher of the Uxtanēs History to print, correctly, according to our thinking, «His Eminence, Uxtanēs, Bishop of *Se(bastia)*...» (33). These observations lead naturally to the question of why Mser Mserean in publishing a portion of Uxtanēs, and later M.-F. Brosset, in his three French studies on the same historian, always made reference simply to Uxtanēs. And why was it that later, as mentioned above, the same Brosset, while translating the original manuscript into French, named Uxtanēs as bishop of *Urha* when his copy of the manuscript could have directed him otherwise? N. Akinean, cognizant of these circumstances, tried in his day to provide the answer by writing, «We do not know on what basis Brosset has given more credence to Kirakos' documentation, in order to entitle his work as «Oukhtanes d'Ourha»; in any case, if, as with Fr. Ališan, we ascribe it to «a slip of the pen»,

(31) Erevan, Matenadaran, MS no. 1774, f. 68.

(32) *Ibid.*

(33) Ed. Vařarřapat, 1871, introduction, pp. A-B.

it still remains a questionable point in this obscure biography of Uxtanēs» (34).

In truth, the answer must be sought in the manuscript copy, used by both Mserean and Brosset, which is in Leningrad. Our examination of this copy showed that it was executed in 1847 through the arrangements of archbishop Yovhannēs Šahxat'unean, from the original Uxtanēs manuscript in the Eĵmiacin library; it was then sent to M.-F. Brosset (35). The most significant point here is that the copyist had totally ignored the Se in the title of the original manuscript, which abbreviation, as we stated above, was correctly included in the printed version as Se(bastia). Thus, neither Mserean or Brosset had seen the abbreviation Se in the copy of the manuscript available to them, and, therefore, could not connect Uxtanēs with any region in their studies or published volumes. However, when in 1870 Brosset published the French translation of Uxtanēs he attached the description «of Urha» to the name Uxtanēs, a designation totally missing, as we have seen, concerning this historian in all his previously published studies. We believe that the answer is very simple. First, the Armenian version had not yet appeared so he was not aware of the Se(bastia) in the title of the original manuscript. Second, his copy had nothing to call his attention to this fact. Third, Brosset had combined the French translation of Uxtanēs to the history of Kirakos Ganjakec'i, also translated by him; that is, the two historians appeared in the same publication, and for Ganjakec'i, Uxtanēs is mentioned as the bishop of Urha. And fourth, in the Karenean catalogue of Eĵmiacin manuscripts that had appeared a few years earlier, departing from Brosset's own 1840 catalogue of the manuscripts in the same library, Uxtanēs' *History* was identified as «Uxtanēs, bishop of Urha. *History*». Thus, after all of these, it was not difficult for Brosset to title his work «Oukhtanes d'Ourha», that is, Uxtanēs of Urha. From this point it is not difficult to understand why the majority of subsequent foreign Armenologists were led to accept Brosset's position.

Yet, the publication in 1871 of the Uxtanēs text failed to convince Armenologists. This question of the uncertainty about Uxtanēs, peculiar to the middle ages, had continued, and still continues even in current historiography. That is, sometimes he is identified

(34) N. Akinean, *Kiwriion kat'olikos Vrac', patmut'iwn Hay-vrakan haraberut'eanc' yot'nerord daru mēj*, Vienna, 1910, pp. 54-5.

(35) Leningrad, Oriental Institute, Armenian manuscript C-10.

only as Uxtanēs, sometimes as of Urhayec'i and sometimes as of Sebastac'i. For example, a substantial number of our historians have identified him only as Uxtanēs. These are G. Ter-Mkrtč'yan (36), N. Adontz (37), H. Manandyan (38), V. P'ap'azean (39), Leo (40), S. Malxasyanc' (41), G. Yovsēp'eanc' (42), K. Tēr-Mkrtč'ean (43), A. Alpoyačean (44), H. S. Anasyan (45), B. Aṛak'elyan (46), H. Harut'yunyan (47), S. Pōlosean (48), H. Pasmajean (49), A. Andreasyan (50), Yovh. Petrosyan (51), M. Zavaryan (52), the editors of the short bibliography of the Maštoc' library (53), S. T. Melik'-Baxšyan (54), and others.

Of course, we need not attribute the mentioning of our historian as simply «Uxtanēs» by the many above-named savants to his being recognized only as bishop Uxtanēs, or historian Uxtanēs in the several

(36) Galust Ter-Mkrtč'yan, *Hayagitakan usumnasirut'yunner*, in Arm., vol. I, Erevan, 1979, pp. 259 and 482.

(37) N. Adontz, *Armenija v Ėpoxu Justinjana*, 2nd ed., Erevan, 1971, pp. 253, 324, 326, 327, 329, 337, 338.

(38) H. Manadyan, *Erker*, in Arm. vol. II, Erevan, 1978, pp. 117-8, 424.

(39) V. P'ap'azean, *Patmut'iwn Hayoc' grakanut'ean*, Tiflis, 1910, p. 165.

(40) Leo, *Erkeri žolovacu*, in Arm., vol. II, Erevan, 1967, p. 230.

(41) S. Malxasyanc', *Matenagitakan ditolut'yunner*, Erevan, 1961, p. 217.

(42) Yovsēp'ean, *Mxit'ar*, p. 13, *idem*, *Niwt'er ew usumnasirut'iwnner hay aruesti ew mšakoyt'i patmut'ean*, fasc. III, New York, 1944, p. 120.

(43) K. Tēr-Mkrtč'ean, «Vrt'anēs K'ert'ot t'ut' Aṭuanic'», *Ararat* (1896), p. 444.

(44) A. Alpoyačean, *Patmut'iwn Evdokio Hayoc'*, Cairo, 1952, p. 472; *idem*, *Patmut'iwn hay gal'akanut'ean*, vol. I, Cairo, 1941, pp. 199, 204, 266.

(45) Anasyan, *Matenagitut'yun*, I, pp. 79, 80, etc.

(46) *Hay žolovrdi patmut'yun*, vol. III, Erevan, 1976, p. 325.

(47) H. Harut'yunyan, *Hayastanə IX-XI darrerum*, Erevan, 1959, p. 223.

(48) *Hay žolovrdi patmut'yun*, vol. II, Erevan, 1965, p. 170.

(49) Hrand Pasmačean, *Hayoc' patmutiwn*, trans. M. Iṣṣan, vol. I, Beirut, 1954, p. 214.

(50) Artašes Andreasyan, *Urvagic Hayoc' patmut'yan ew haykakan mšakuyt'in*, Erevan, 1968, p. 365.

(51) H. Petrosyan, *Hay hin ew mġnadaryan grakanut'yan hamar'ot bibliografja (5-18 dd.)*, Erevan, 1941, p. 84.

(52) M. Zavaryan, *Urvagcer hay-vrac' grakanut'yan kaperi patmut'yan 19-20 dd.*, Erevan, 1959, p. 8.

(53) Ō. Eganyan, A. Zeyt'unyan, P. Ant'abyan, *C'ac'ak jeragrac' Maštoc'i anvan Matenatarani*, vol. I, Erevan, 1965, MSS nos. 1774, 3732, and p. 1590.

(54) S. T. Melik'-Baxšyan, *Hayoc' patmut'yan albyuragitut'yun*, Erevan, 1979, pp. 100, 102, 144, 182, 197.

sources from the middle ages that we referred to. The principal reason must be found, we believe, in the only publication of the *History* of Uxtanēs, Vaġaršapat, 1871. The editor, unknown to us, used as title a heading added later to the manuscript, «Bishop Uxtanēs, sections...», a long heading given by an author contemporary to the writing of the work, where it is revealed that Uxtanēs was bishop of Sebastia; surprisingly, it was included in the introduction to the book. Unfortunately, the majority of scholars have ignored the long introduction, being content to mention only the title on the cover, «Bishop Uxtanēs, ...»

Uxtanēs was regarded as bishop of Sebastia by Al. Eric'ean (55), El. Durean (56), A. Zaminean (57), M. Abelyan (58), H. Asturean (59), M. Mkryan (60), H. Thorossian (61), and others. Ē. Ališan was one of the earlier partisans of this group. When in 1862 he published the *History* of Vardan Vardapet Arevelc'i, he noted the author's lines about Uxtanēs' establishing the feast day of the Forty Martyrs, with the following footnote: «This is the bishop of Sebastia, and historian, from whom he learns about and mentions the occasion» (62), that is, the historian Uxtanēs had been bishop of Sebastia. Later, when the French translation and the original Armenian text were already published, Ališan, having surely noticed the different opinions on where the historian had been primate, and having placed Uxtanēs as bishop of Urġa in the first part of his *Hayapatum* (63), nevertheless, in the same work, in a later part, states the following about Uxtanēs, «His position was bishop of Sebastia, although Kirakos says he was bishop of Urġa, perhaps by a slip of the pen. His being bishop of Sebastia is attested to by the renowned celebration of this city's feast of the Forty Martyrs, and by his writing the history of the Cad people

(55) *P'orj*, Tiflis (1881), No. 3, p. 125.

(56) E. Durean, *Patmut'iwn hay matenagrut'ean i val zamanakac' minc'ew mer ōrerā*, Constantinople, 1885, p. 43.

(57) A. Zaminean, *Hay grakanut'ian patmut'iwn*, Nor Naxiġewan, 1914, pp. 153-155.

(58) M. Abelyan, *Hayoc' hin grakanut'yan patmut'yun*, vol. I, Erevan, 1944, p. 517.

(59) H. Asturean, *Patmut'yun Hayoc'*, Buenos Aires, 1947, p. 210.

(60) M. Mkryan, *Grigor Narekac'i*, Erevan, 1955, p. 25.

(61) H. Thorossian, *Histoire de la littérature arménienne*, Paris, 1951, pp. 125-127.

(62) Vardan, *Universal History*, ed. 1862, p. 42, n. 2.

(63) Ališan, *Hayapatum*, vol. I, Venice, 1901, pp. 85-87.

of the region» (64). Here the renowned Armenologist is altogether on the right path; N. Akinean, as we mentioned, also commented on this. As far as the reason why the region of the Cad people should be connected with Sebastia, that remains to be examined, and is worthy of a study at a later opportunity. The grammarian H. Gazančean, victim of the massacres, was also among those who regarded Uxtanēs as bishop of Sebastia, although without certainty, for he writes, «The historian Uxtanēs, who is believed to have been bishop of Sebastia» (65).

Despite all of this, there are those scholars who consider Uxtanēs as bishop of Urha, or Urhayec'i. Such Armenologists are K. Patkanecan (66), N. Čivanean, who even writes in his handy dictionary, «Bishop Uxtanēs, Assyrian bishop of Edessa» (67), the German Armenologist H. Gelzer (68), French Armenologists F. Macler in his catalog of Armenian manuscripts in the Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale (69), Jacques de Morgan (70) — the last two no doubt following Brosset — L. Melik'set'-Bek (71), while Aram Sahakean in his *Heroic Urfa and Its Armenian Sons*, names Uxtanēs as one of that city's great figures (72). Finally, A. T. T'ovmasyan, as late as 1962, identifies our historian as «Uxtianēs (*sic!*)» of Urha (73).

Besides these three different opinions there is a fourth, though not an independent idea, but a blend of the last two. Belonging to this group of Armenologists are H. G. Zarbhanalean (74), who despite

(64) *Ibid.*

(65) H. Gazančean, *Patmut'iwn hay grakanut'ean*, Antelias, 1970, p. 43.

(66) K. Patkanecan, «Hay patmagirneri erkasirut'eanc' c'uc'akə», *P'orj* (1880), no. 1, p. 17.

(67) N. Čivanean, *Arjēn pararan patmakan, ašxarhagrakan ew dič'apanakan hatuk anuank'*, Constantinople, 1879, p. 143.

(68) H. Gelzer, *Hama'ot patmut'iwn Hayoc'*, Arm. trans., Vienna, 1897, pp. 31-2.

(69) Frédéric Macler, *Catalogue des manuscrits arméniens et géorgiens de la Bibliothèque nationale*, Paris, 1908, pp. 117-8, 198.

(70) Jacques de Morgan, *Histoire du peuple arménien*, Paris, 1919, p. 99.

(71) L. Melik'set'-Bek, «Polos Taronec'i XI-XII dareri hay matenagire ew T'ondrakec'i u cayt' Hayerə», *Ejmiacin* (1960), No. 4, p. 43.

(72) A. Sahakean, *Diwc'aznakan Urfan ew ir hayordinerə*, Beirut, 1955, pp. 276-278.

(73) A. T. T'ovmasyan, *Hin ew minjnadaryan hay k'reakan iravunk'*, Erevan, 1962, p. 168.

(74) G. Zarbhanalean, *Patmut'iwn hay hin dprut'ean (IV-XIII dar)*, 4th ed., Venice, 1932, pp. 555-560.

at first admitting that Uxtanēs was bishop of Sebastia, later also assumed historian Kirakos' opinion that he was bishop of Urha. The following have also given the same qualified opinion: Conybeare (75), M. Ormanean (76), N. Akinean (77), H. Ačaryan (78), H. K. K'iparean (79), Polarean (80), and others.

Thus, despite the publication of the original Armenian text of Uxtanēs, and despite the number of Armenologists that recognize him as the bishop of Sebastia, the learned literature still continues to identify him as simply Uxtanēs, or of Sebastia, or bishop of Urha, or without any specific descriptor that would identify him as from Sebastia or from Urha. Directing our attention to the matter of establishing that Uxtanēs was bishop of Sebastia, we must once again observe that it would be wrong to depend solely on the author's manuscript and the abbreviation Se that appears there, which, and we consider it correct, the publisher took to be read as Sebastia. To this end there is other evidence that serves to establish our claim. As some of the scholars who have preceded us have observed, the establishment by Uxtanēs of the feast of the Forty Martyrs in Sebastia is such evidence. But more on this later. A detailed study of the first section of Uxtanēs' history proves the historian's intimate knowledge of the environment of Sebastia. In chapter 69 of the first section, entitled «Further on the same matter of the ordination of His Beatitude St. Gregory as Patriarch», the historian describes how Gregory the Illuminator as «Patriarch of All Armenians», on his return from being ordained, stopped in Sebastia with his entourage where he stayed for a while, and laid the foundation for a church which was built by men of faith by authority of Gregory the Illuminator, and named St. Gregory. As it appears, the reference is to the monastery of St. Gregory the Illuminator that is near Sebastia. From the same paragraph it appears that Uxtanēs borrowed the fact from the history of Agat'angelos that Gregory the Illuminator had, on his return, stopped in Sebastia (81),

(75) *HA* (1902), no. 1, p. 6 *et seq.*

(76) Małakia Ōrmanean, *Azgapatum*, vol. I, Constantinople, 1912, p. 1184.

(77) N. Akinean, *Kiwrión*, p. 55 *et seq.*

(78) Hrač'ya Ačaryan, *Hayoc' anjananunneri bararan*, vol. IV, Erevan, 1948, p. 200.

(79) K. K'iparean, *Patmut'iwn hay grakanut'ean*, part I, Venice, 1944, pp. 250-1.

(80) Norayr Polarean, *Hay grołner, V-XVII dar*, Jerusalem, 1971, p. 154.

(81) Agat'angelos, *Patmut'iwn Hayoc'*, ed. Venice, 1835, p. 601.

a point that was also cited by the father of historians, Movsēs Xorenac'i (82), as well as Yovhan Mamikonean (83), and others. However, there is nothing in Agat'angelos or in our other historians about the building of the above-mentioned monastery; therefore, Uxtanēs must have gathered such information from the local tales of Sebastia, when he was bishop of that city. But the most noteworthy and important aspect of the above-mentioned paragraph is the comment of an observer, which Uxtanēs demonstrates to have been, when he writes in his history that church «still stands at the edge of the city» (84), that is, that the Gregory the Illuminator monastery still existed near the city of Sebastia during his time. It was that ancient Armenian monument of Sebastia that the Turks converted to a mosque in 1593, as related by Yovhannēs of Sebastia (85). As told by A. Łanalanean, there is a tradition handed down to our day regarding the dissolution of the St. Gregory the Illuminator monastery of Sebastia, according to which one day, during the time of Turkish domination, when the Armenians were celebrating Divine Liturgy, a Moslem *mulla* entered the church, ascended the bema (altar), and announced that Christians no longer had any right to be there because it had been converted into a mosque (86).

It should be noted that the St. Gregory the Illuminator monastery was one of the important centers of Armenian letters. The oldest of the surviving manuscripts from that monastery is a Gospel dated 1193, which until the great massacres had been kept in the church of the village of Karp'el in Vaspurakan. Another manuscript, now in the Maštoc' Matenadaran No. 987, is also a Gospel written at the same monastery in 1211. Again, the Erevan Matenadaran also has a manuscript executed there in 1239-40, a compendium, No. 7574. The latest manuscript written in this monastery is a Breviary, copied by scribe Mxit'ar, in that same fateful year of 1593 when the Turks forcibly converted the church to a mosque; the manuscript is now at

(82) Movsēs Xorenac'i, *Patmut'iwn Hayoc'*, ed. Venice, 1827, p. 329.

(83) Yovhan Mamikonean, *Patmut'iwn Tarōnoy*, ed. A. Abrahamyan, Erevan, 1941, p. 78.

(84) Uxtanēs, p. 99.

(85) Yovhannēs Sebastac'i, *Patmut'iwn Sebastioy*, ed. B. L. Č'ugaszyan, Erevan, pp. 63-4; see also S. Ėp'rikyan, *Patkerazard bnašxarhik bararan*, vol. II, Venice, 1907, p. 113.

(86) A. Łanalanyan, *Avandapatum*, Erevan, 1969, p. 245.

the library of the Vienna Mekhitarists, No. 518 (87). This represents the last known mention of the monastery.

A study of chapter 61 of the first section of the *History* also lends support to Uxtanēs' being bishop of Sebastia. There, in describing the documentation of the Forty Martyrs of Sebastia, the author notes that he had studied the circumstances and ascertained the day of their martyrdom, and, most importantly, he had directed the people of his diocese to commemorate that date every year. Here it is worth emphasizing that the only Armenian publication of Uxtanēs' history had left out a most important sentence indisputably establishing Uxtanēs as bishop of the diocese of Sebastia. It was only recently, during our comparison of the printed text with the original manuscript, that we succeeded in bringing this fact to light. Here is the complete passage in which we have underlined the portion left out of the printed text: «And it was the day when they [the Martyrs] were removed from their dwellings, on the fifteenth of the month of Areg, which we did not carelessly determine, but verified carefully through benign and devout persons, and accordingly set the date for the feast of the Forty Martyrs *and designated it for the people of our diocese* (emphasis ours, S.K.) to celebrate it from year to year to the Glory of God» (88). In this manner Uxtanēs indicates that for his diocese he had proclaimed that date each year as a feast for these saints.

Finally, another important bit of evidence recently made known to us, establishing Uxtanēs as bishop of Sebastia, comes from Vanakan vardapet's (second half of the twelfth century to first half of the thirteenth) *Catechism*, a copy of which found its way into the library of the St. James Monastery in Jerusalem in 1273. The manuscript was written in the monastery of Getik, and contains the following question and answer pertaining to the person of Uxtanēs. «Who is Uxtanēs who wrote on the emperors and the history?» The answer given is, «He is *bishop of Sebastia*, the pupil of Anania vardapet Narekac'i» (emphasis ours, S.K.) (89).

(87) S. K'olanġyan [Kolandjian], «*Sebastiayi gavari grċ'ut'yan kentronner*», and, «*Sebastiayi gavari hayerem jeragrac' hišataranner*», both unpublished studies.

(88) Uxtanēs, p. 87. For the section omitted in the printed edition and restored above with underlining, see, Erevan, Matenadaran, MS no. 1774, ff. 128<sup>v</sup>-129.

(89) N. Polarean, *Mayr c'uc'ak jeragrac' srboc' Yakopeanc'*, vol. IV, Jerusalem, 1969, MS no. 1288, p. 484.

All the evidence offered above shows that the tenth century historian Uxtanēs was indisputably the bishop of Sebastia, and primate of the diocese; the idea of his having been bishop of Urha comes only from Kirakos Ganjakec'i, who had, unfortunately, many followers during the middle ages and even today. This opinion is without foundation; at most Uxtanēs might have been in Urha, but only after he had written his *History*, since this work supports his having been bishop of Sebastia. This agrees with the greater part of the information contained in the earliest Armenian primary sources.

Having shown that Uxtanēs indisputably was the bishop of the diocese of Sebastia, there still remains the matter of ascertaining just when that was. N. Akinean points out that, «There is some difficulty in putting Uxtanēs on the bishop's throne in the second half of the century (in 986) when Uxtanēs writes, before Asolik he mentions as bishop of Sebastia a certain Sion, who under pressure of the local Greek metropolitan embraced the Greek doctrine». At the same time Akinean believes that Uxtanēs became bishop of Sebastia after Sion. Recognizing the religious persecution perpetrated by the Greek church on the Armenians of Sebastia, Melitene, and elsewhere, Akinean points out that, «It is certain that not until that year (986) can the bishop's throne in Sebastia be accorded to Uxtanēs. Perhaps catholicos Xač'ik suspended Sion after that episode, giving the post to Uxtanēs, assuming that Ōrbelean's evidence is correct» (90).

The comprehensive letter brought forth by Asolik and written by Xač'ik I catholicos Aršaruni to the metropolitan of Sebastia, and another letter written to Samuel Kamrjajorec'i concerning Theodorus, metropolitan of Melitene, have an important significance in exposing the intolerance of the Greek church in 986 toward the Armenians in the indicated places (91). Taking note of the above-mentioned proofs we are led to believe that Uxtanēs must have been bishop of Sebastia before the aforementioned bishop Sion, rather than after, as N. Akinean had believed. Our position is supported by Uxtanēs' book which must have been completed before 986 and in which, as we have seen, he mentions his being primate of the diocese of Sebastia. Thus, undoubtedly, Uxtanēs must have been bishop of Sebastia years

(90) Akinean, *Kiwrion*, p. 52.

(91) Step'anos Tarōnec'i (Asolik), *Patmut'iwn tiezerakan*, 2nd ed., St. Petersburg, 1885, pp. 202-243.

before the persecutions directed against Armenians in 986, approximately between 970 and 985.

Here it is important to observe also that while N. Akinean believed in 1910 that Uxtanēs must have written his history in 987 or in 980, in a later article of 1944, that is 34 years after the preceding one, the gifted Armenologist reexamined his earlier position, and taking into account new information about calendar dates, which also emerged from Uxtanēs' *History*, he finally concluded that its author must have had contact with Anania of Narek in 980, and written the *History* in 982 (92). Thus, it is indisputable that Uxtanēs must have been bishop of Sebastia before the persecutions against the Armenians by the Greek Orthodox Church in 986.

Proceeding from this rectification it is necessary also to reexamine the book of succession of the Armenian bishops of Sebastia, and regard Uxtanēs as the bishop of Sebastia immediately preceding Sion (d. 1029), a matter that, because of the lack of proof in his day, Yovhannēs of Sebastia could not have resolved (93). We note that our opinion has recently been accepted by Aṛak'el Patrik, the indefatigable artist-philologist, compiler of the history of Sebastia, who has made corrections in the table of bishops of Sebastia based on our conclusions about this historian (94).

Believing that with this article we have put an end to the many centuries of confusion about where Uxtanēs held office, favoring his being bishop of Sebastia, we point out that we are preparing the publication of a critical edition based on all manuscript copies and printed texts, of this historian's work, with introduction, necessary annotations, and including the newly found parts of the second section.

*Translated from Armenian by Arra Avakian.*

(92) N. Akinean, «Banasirakan hatakotorner. 3. Erb grac ē Uxtanēs ir patmut'iwnə'», *Awetik'* (Beirut, 1944), nos. 5-8, p. 57.

(93) Yovhannēs Sebastac'i, *Patmut'iwn Sebastioy*, p. 187. We do not know if the Sion, bishop of Sebastia, who died in 1029 is the same person as the Sion, bishop of Sebastia, who was persecuted in 986 and forced to convert, perhaps later again became bishop. If the answer is yes, then we would think that by the bull (*kondak*) of Xač'ik catholicos quoted by Asoṭik he was again raised to the bishop of the diocese, even though Ačāryan thought him to be another person; Ačāryan, *Anjnanunneri bararan*, vol. IV, p. 522, n. 4.

(94) Aṛak'el N. Patrik, *Patmagirk' yusamatean Sepastio ew gawari hayut'ean*, vol. I, Beirut, 1946, p. 84, n. 1.